

REMARKS

1. Applicant has submitted this supplemental response to modify the language in the final clause of claim 1 as indicated above. Applicant present the original remarks below for ease of reference.

2. Claims 1-5 stand rejected as anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Grando, et al. Applicant traverses.

One of the key features of the present invention is that fact that all the valve units (not including the independent flame safety valve) are operated by a single operating spindle. As is clearly recited in the claims, that spindle is a unitary piece, a one-piece stem.

The Examiner has posited that the finding in *Howard* that forming in one piece what has formerly been formed in two pieces requires only routine skill in the art is applicable to the claims at hand. Applicant submits that the *Howard* finding is only applicable if there is no change in the function of the article in question.

In the instant case, the Grando spindle is a two piece unit. Inner shaft 24 is designed to move in an interior of outer shaft 19. See Figs. 2-4 of Grando. There is clearly a relative movement between the two shafts 19 and 24. Therefore the restriction that the spindle be a single unit cannot be construed as an obvious extension of the Grando spindle. The Grando unit could not function with a unitary shaft. A unitary shaft would eliminate the relative movement of elements 19 and 24, thereby destroying the efficacy of the device.

Moreover, the Grando device does not include the equivalent of the safety cut-off means 21-24 of the present invention. Grando closure member 35 only seals the gas flow from the auxiliary outlet 8. As can be seen in Figs. 1-4 of Grando, closure member 35 has no effect whatsoever on the main outlet 6, sealing only auxiliary outlet 8 from the gas inlet

4 (visible only in Fig. 1). In contrast, the safety cut-off means 21-24 of the present invention is clearly defined as blocking the flow of gas from the inlet 6 to any of the outlet conduits 7, 8, 20 in the device.

In order to anticipate or to render obvious claims, the prior art must disclose or indicate all the elements of the claims. In this instance, there is no reference in the cited prior art that teaches a unitary actuating spindle as is claimed in present claim 1. Moreover, there is no reference that teaches a safety cut-off means that blocks passage from the inlet to all the outlets in the device as is also claimed in present claim 1. Accordingly, the prior art cannot be said to anticipate or to render obvious the present claims.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant now asserts that all of the grounds for rejection have been traversed or overcome by amendment, and that all of the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration of the objections and rejections, and solicits allowance of the present claims at an early date.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 29, 2005

Registration No: 32,737
Telephone: (408) 778-3440



Keith Kline
THE KLINE LAW FIRM, P.C.
14910 Bonner Court
Morgan Hill, CA 95037-5925